

REMARKS

Claims 1-55 and 59-61 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-55 and 59-61 are rejected. Claims 57 and 58 are objected to. Claims 1, 11, 25, 37, 46, 53 and 61 are amended. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the objected to subject matter. The applicant also thanks the Examiner for the time spent in the interview of March 17 in which the invention was summarized.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-12, 14-16, 37-38, 41-43, 45-47, 50-51, 53, 54 and 59-61 under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Soltys et al. (US patent No. 6, 533, 662) in view of Olah et al (U.S. Patent No. 6, 446, 119). The rejection is respectively traversed.

The present invention, as described in the remaining claims, are implemented on a gaming machine operable to play a game of chance. The present invention describes, as recited in claim 1 as amended, that a sequence of game presentation frames for use in a video game presentation of a game of chance played on the gaming machine are generated and frame data from the selected game presentation frame are incorporated into a game history frame. The game history frame may be stored on a memory device on the gaming machine and may be later recalled for display. The generation of the frames used in the game of chance, the selection of a frame for the game history frame and the generation of a game history frame is performed under control of the master gaming controller. At least one game history frame is generated for each game of chance played on the gaming machine.

Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to consider the following arguments in regards to the claims as amended. In the present invention the master gaming controller generates the sequence of frames used in a game presentation, selects a frame from the game presentation, generates a game history frame from the selected frame and stores it. At least one game history frame is generated for each game of chance played on the gaming machine. This differs from the Solyts reference, which teaches that the frames are recorded by a security camera outside of the gaming machine and then captured and processed by a system outside the gaming machine. The Solyts reference does not teach all of the steps method being performed on the gaming machine. The Olah reference teaches frame capture for a limited time period specified by the user. However, in the present invention, the frame capture is applied to each game of chance. Thus, the generation, selection and capturing of frames takes place whenever games are played on the gaming machine, which is unpredictable. Thus, the Olah method, which requires a specification of specific time intervals, does not seem applicable to the apparatus and methods of the present invention.

Thus, for at least these reasons, the combination of Soltys and Olah can't be said to render obviousness claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-12, 14-16, 37-38, 41-43, 45-47, 50-51, 53, 54 and 59-61 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

The Examiner relies on Acres to describe that is desirable to increase memory space in a gaming device. Applicant believes this teaching in Acres cited by the Examiner does not correct the defects in the combination of Soltys and Olah described above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention and the lack of a motivation for the combination. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Soltys, Olah and Acres can't be said to render obvious claims 3, 4, 19, 24 and 44 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 39 and 40 under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Soltys et al. (US patent No. 6, 533, 662) in view of Olah et al (U.S. Patent No. 6, 446, 119) in further view of Cumbers (6,234, 900). The rejection is respectively traversed.

The Examiner relies on Cumbers to teach recording a players image on a gaming machine. In Cumbers, a players image is analyzed to determines the players identity and corresponding player tracking account. Applicant believes this teaching in Cumbers cited by the Examiner does not correct the defects in the combination of Soltys and Olah described above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention and the lack of a motivation for the combination. The Examiner states the motivation for this combination is the need for more security on a gaming machine. Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to point out where this taught in the references cited by the Examiner. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Soltys, Olah and Cumbers can't be said to render obvious claims 7, 39 and 40 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

The Examiner rejected claims 13, 22, 23, 25-33, 36 and 48-49 under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Soltys et al. (US patent No. 6, 533, 662) in view of Olah et al (U.S. Patent No. 6, 446, 119) in further view of Alcorn (6,149,522). The rejection is respectively traversed.

The Examiner relies on Alcorn to teach encryption. Applicant believes this teaching in Alcorn cited by the Examiner does not correct the defects in the combination of Soltys and Olah described above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention and the lack of a motivation for the combination. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Soltys, Olah and Alcorn can't be said to render obvious claims 13, 22, 23, 25-33, 36 and 48-49 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

The Examiner rejected claims 17 and 55 under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Soltys et al. (US patent No. 6, 533, 662) in view of Olah et al (U.S. Patent No. 6, 446, 119) in further view of Acres (6,319, 125). The rejection is respectively traversed.

The Examiner relies on Acres to describe memory utilization in a processor. Applicant believes this description in Acres cited by the Examiner does not correct the defects in the combination of Soltys and Olah described above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention and the lack of a motivation for the combination. Therefore, for at least

these reasons, the combination of Soltys, Olah and Acres can't be said to render obvious claims 17 and 55 the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

The Examiner rejected claims 20, 21, 34 and 35 under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Soltys et al. (US patent No. 6, 533, 662) in view of Olah et al (U.S. Patent No. 6, 446, 119) in further view of Alcorn (6,149,522) in further view of Acres (6,319, 125) further in view of Sanford II et al (6, 021, 196). The rejection is respectively traversed.


Examiner relies on Sanford to describe color reduction and compression/decompression. Applicant believes this description in Sanford cited by the Examiner does not correct the defects in the combination of Soltys, Olah, Alcorn and Acres described above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention and the lack of a motivation for the combination. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Soltys, Olah, Alcorn, Acres and Sanford can't be said to render obvious claims 20, 21, 34 and 35 the rejection is believed overcome thereby. The rejection is respectively traversed.

The Examiner rejected claims 52 under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Soltys et al. (US patent No. 6, 533, 662) in view of Olah et al (U.S. Patent No. 6, 446, 119) in further view of Slye et al. (5,395, 242).

Examiner relies on Slye to describe multiple modes of playback. Applicant believes this description in Slye cited by the Examiner does not correct the defects in the combination of Soltys and Olah described above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention and the lack of a motivation for the combination. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Soltys, Olah and Slye can't be said to render obvious claims 52 the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



David P. Olynick
Reg. No.: 48,615

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
510-843-6200

Application No. 09/689, 498
Reply to office Action of June 25, 2003